

Communication from Public

Name: linda blank

Date Submitted: 12/12/2023 09:35 AM

Council File No: 22-0392

Comments for Public Posting: I join the Coalition for a Beautiful Los Angeles along with 28 Neighborhood and Community Councils, 24 environmental and community organizations and thousands of Angelenos in opposition to Metro's proposal to install digital billboards along many of the City's busiest freeways and commercial corridors for the following reasons: PLUM amended the Program to reduce takedown of existing billboards from 125 to 50 prior to installation of new digital billboards. This is in contrast to the billboard industry's 2002 offer to remove 2,500 static billboards in exchange for 50 freeway facing digital billboard structures; PLUM amended the Program to allow takedowns of poster board sized signs (200 square feet) instead of takedowns of actual billboards; PLUM amended the Program to increase hours of operation for freeway-facing signs to operate nearly 24-hours per day from 5:00 a.m. to 3:00 a.m.; PLUM opened the door to extending the digital billboard Program to a 30-year contract instead of the recommended 20-year term; Eight of 12 non-freeway facing digital billboards are planned for installation on the City's High Injury Network streets; Digital billboards are planned for parcels identified for housing, within 500 feet of open space and residential uses, and impacting historic resources; There has been no cost/benefit analysis and when asked Metro hasn't responded sufficiently; The City has not included any conditions giving City Council the authority to impose additional corrective measures if the digital billboard impacts can't be mitigated as described in the Program, e.g., are proven to increase accidents, light glare, block visibility, etc. Further, there are no provisions to update to new technologies as they become available over the life of this decades-long Program; The LA Times criticized the City in a Dec. 6 Editorial, letters to the Editor in response on Dec. 10, and in an earlier February, 2023 opinion piece.

Communication from Public

Name: Bob Anderson for Sherman Oaks Homeowners Association
Date Submitted: 12/12/2023 09:50 AM
Council File No: 22-0392
Comments for Public Posting: SOHA STRONGLY OPPOSES THE METRO TCN AS DETAILED IN ATTACHED LETTER. This letter was submitted in July 2023 but ignored by the City Council. We resubmit it because every point in the letter is still applicable to this boondoggle project.

President

Matt Epstein

Vice Presidents

Bob Anderson
Maria Pavlou Kalban

Treasurer

John Isen

Secretary

Jay Weitzler

Richard Close, *President*
1977-2022



SHERMAN OAKS HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION

Founded in 1964

POST OFFICE BOX 5223
SHERMAN OAKS, CALIFORNIA 91413

www.SOHA914.com

SOHA914@gmail.com

(818) 377-4590

Board of Directors

Bob Anderson
Matt Epstein
Jules Feir
Tom Glick
John Isen
Maria Pavlou Kalban
Sean Kurzweil
Marshall Long
Larry Slade
Nancy Sogioan
Jay Weitzler



www.facebook.com/soha914

July 10, 2023 **RESUBMITTED ON DECEMBER 9, 2023 BECAUSE CITY AND METRO
IGNORED EVERY OPPOSING POINT CONCERNING THIS BOONDOGGLE**

Terri Osborne
Los Angeles City Planning Department
Metro Transportation Communication Network (Council File 22-0392)
terri.osborne@lacity.org

**Subject: SOHA Strongly Opposes Metro’s Transportation Communication Network (TCN) and
LA City Planning Department’s TCN Ordinance That Would Implement It**

References

1. LA City Council, *Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) for the development of a Transportation Communication Network (TCN) Program between the City and Metro, establishing a revenue-sharing framework that provides the City with 50 percent of net revenue from outdoor advertising on TCN structures located within the boundaries of the City*, December 8, 2021
2. LA Planning Department, *Transportation Communication Network District Ordinance, Final Draft*
3. Metro, *Transportation Communication Network CEQA Draft EIR Presentation*, October 2022
4. Los Angeles Planning Department, *Fact Sheet – Digital Signs: LA Metro’s Transportation Communication Network (TCN)*
5. Metro Board Report to Planning and Programming Committee, *Transportation Communication Network Environmental Impact Report, January 18, 2023*

The Sherman Oaks Homeowners Association **strongly opposes** the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority’s (Metro’s) **Transportation Communication Network (TCN)** and the LA City Planning TCN Ordinance that would implement the TCN in any way.

Although we have many reasons for opposing the TCN and TCN Ordinance, **our primary reason is that we can find no person nor any organization that supports the TCN.** As of July 5th, there are Community Impact Statements from 16 different Neighborhood Councils on Council File 22-0392 – and all oppose or strongly oppose the TCN. No NC Impact Statements support the TCN. There are 38 communications from the public on the Council File – and all oppose or strongly oppose the TCN. There is also a letter from former Councilmember Koretz expressing his concerns about the TCN. No public communications support the TCN. The Hillside Federation opposes the TCN as “... designed to attract the attention of as many people as possible, they pose a danger to drivers and bathe the surrounding ecology and homes with light pollution.” Scenic America opposes the TCN based on their legal opinion as “... an unmitigated disaster for the City of Los Angeles and its citizens.”

We have one simple question. **Why is the LA City Council considering a TCN project that has zero support from the people of Los Angeles?** This is a no-brainer – it is unwanted and unneeded.

TCN is unwanted because its displays will be a distraction for everyone exposed to them. They are HUGE and HIGH (see figure below) – much larger than existing freeway displays. Although limited to minimal animation, the TCN displays are designed to attract the attention of as many people as possible. They pose dangerous distractions to drivers and pollute surrounding communities and homes with light.

TCN Displays Are Huge and High



In January 2023, the *LA Times* reported “... 312 people were killed in traffic collisions last year [2022], 5 percent more than in 2021 and a 29 percent increase over 2020. LA’s streets remain particularly deadly for pedestrians and bicyclists ...” Many attribute increasing traffic collisions and deaths to driver distraction. **The TCN will cause more driver distraction on freeways and streets near sign structures and will most probably increase traffic collision deaths.**

TCN is unneeded because the information on its displays is already available on our smartphones and becoming more available on our vehicle displays – except the TCN advertising – which most of us don’t want or need. In fact, smartphones and vehicles give step-by-step route instructions and traffic information – so who needs a distracting 50-foot display. And TCN will be outmoded technology in ten years – when all of us will have the latest technology on our new smartphones and vehicles. Any additional communication and safety functions that TCN might provide don’t require displays at all.

TCN is really a money grab. A Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) between Metro (county) and the City of Los Angeles (Reference 1) gives LA half the net advertising revenue from TCN. Everyone we talk to is convinced money is the primary driving force for TCN. But TCN operation and maintenance costs will be high – and time will tell just how much “net” revenue LA actually receives.

The Planning Department’s draft TCN District Ordinance (Reference 2) confirms that the **TCN displays are huge and very high– making them even more of a dangerous distraction to drivers.** It states “A maximum total of 33 Freeway Facing Sign faces shall be permitted. Freeway Facing Signs may be either single-faced or double-faced. A maximum total of 60 Sign Faces shall be permitted.” Ordinance Table 7-1 shows that 32 signs have 672 square-foot displays (about 50 by 14 feet), and one has a 1,200 square-foot display. Sign height limits vary from 50 to 100 feet above grade, the typical being 80 to 90 feet.

SOHA Strongly Opposes Transportation Communication Network – July 10, 2023

Metro’s TCN CEQA Draft EIR Presentation from October 2022 (Reference 3) further enlightens us on the key TCN components:

- Intelligent Technology – TCN Structures incorporate Metro’s Regional Integration of Intelligent Transportation Systems technology;
- Roadway Efficiency – TCN Structures provide real time data collection to aid in traffic control, bus transit signal priority, and overall bus/rail passenger experience;
- Improve Public Safety & Communication – TCN Structures broadcast public safety and Metro messaging throughout the TCN to commuters; and
- Revenue Generation for Transportation Projects.

As noted earlier – drivers already have all the intelligent technology they need on their smartphones and vehicles. **The fourth bullet – revenue generation – appears to be TCN’s driving force for Metro and the LA City Council.** TCN will be expensive to build, operate, maintain, and upgrade. TCN funding would be better spent on safer and more plentiful public transit.

The Planning Department’s TCN Fact Sheet (Reference 4) includes a TCN display structure illustration on the I-5 freeway near San Fernando Road (page 11). The fact sheet illustration distorts and downplays the huge size and height of the planned TCN structure. The figure below provides a more realistic representation of the 50-foot-wide display – more than three traffic lanes wide – which is 85 feet high. The TCN Ordinance (Reference 2) sets the maximum display size and 85-foot height for this site located at Assessor Parcel Number 2408038900. **These displays must be huge and high because most are two-sided and must be visible from both sides of the freeway – to maximize advertising revenue – and also distraction.**

LA Planning Department Fact Sheet Downplays TCN Size and Height



This January’s Metro Board Report on the TCN Environmental Impact Report (Reference 5) provides the final piece of the TCN puzzle. It lists Metro’s eight key EIR objectives. The fifth objective is “Maximizing Advertising Revenue”. **Since when did maximizing revenue become a key environmental objective?** As noted earlier, the public sees TCN as an unneeded and unwanted money grab.

SOHA urges the Planning Department and City Council to stop TCN immediately in any form.

MOST IMPORTANTLY – It is critical that all public comments and communications on TCN received by the Planning Department be transferred and posted on the Council File Management System (CF 22-0392) so the entire City Council can read them before their next vote on TCN.

SOHA Strongly Opposes Transportation Communication Network – July 10, 2023

Thank you. Please contact me at BobHillsideOrdinance@gmail.com or (213) 364-7470

Respectfully,



Bob Anderson
Board Member and Chair, Transportation Committee
Sherman Oaks Homeowners Association

cc: Councilmember Nithya Raman, CD4 (Sherman Oaks)
Council President Paul Krekorian, CD2
Councilmember Eunisses Hernandez, CD1
Councilmember Bob Blumenfield, CD3
Councilmember Katy Yaroslavsky, CD5
Councilmember Imelda Padilla, CD6
Councilmember Monica Rodriguez, CD7
Councilmember Marqueece Harris-Dawson, CD8
Councilmember Curren Price, Jr, CD9
Councilmember Heather Hutt, CD10
Councilmember Traci Park, CD11
Councilmember John Lee, CD12
Councilmember Hugo Soto-Martinez, CD13
Councilmember Kevin de Leon, CD14
Councilmember Tim McOsker, CD15
Mayor Karen Bass
Lindsay Imber, President, Sherman Oaks Neighborhood Council
Jeff Kalban, Chair, SONC Vision Committee
City Clerk for Council File 22-0392

Communication from Public

Name: F. Fisher

Date Submitted: 12/12/2023 12:26 PM

Council File No: 22-0392

Comments for Public Posting: Hi, Please vote NO to digital billboards. They are distracting and mess up the beauty of Los Angeles. Biggest reason to vote NO is that digital billboards will disincentivize film & tv production in LA. We want the landscapes authentic when we shoot. Thank you
F. Fisher SagAftra

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 12/12/2023 12:52 PM

Council File No: 22-0392

Comments for Public Posting: What we need are safer hyways not ones increasingly distracting ones. Don't we have enough visual blight and car accidents? Follow the money. Who's getting it for this thoughtlessly insane idea?

Communication from Public

Name: Carolyn Seeman

Date Submitted: 12/12/2023 01:41 PM

Council File No: 22-0392

Comments for Public Posting: We join the Coalition for a Beautiful Los Angeles along with 28 neighborhood and community councils, 24 environmental and community organizations, and thousands of Angelenos in opposition to Metro's proposal to install digital billboards along many of the City's busiest freeways and commercial corridors for the following reasons: The program has now been reduced from the requirement of taking down 125 existing billboards to just 50, and some of those signs are just poster board dimensions, not actual billboards; The hours of operation for freeway-facing signs have been substantially increased to operate nearly 24-hours per day starting at 3:00 a.m. instead of 5:00 a.m.; digital billboards are planned for parcels identified for housing, within 500 feet of open space and residential uses, and impacting historic resources; and The city has not included any conditions giving City Council the authority to impose additional corrective measures if the digital billboard impacts can't be mitigated. Carolyn Seeman 11747 Otsego Street Valley Village, CA 91607

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 12/12/2023 01:57 PM

Council File No: 22-0392

Comments for Public Posting: I join the Coalition for a Beautiful Los Angeles along with 28 Neighborhood and Community Councils, 24 environmental and community organizations and thousands of Angelenos in opposition to Metro's proposal to install digital billboards along many of the City's busiest freeways and commercial corridors for the following reasons: PLUM amended the Program to reduce takedown of existing billboards from 125 to 50 prior to installation of new digital billboards. This is in contrast to the billboard industry's 2002 offer to remove 2,500 static billboards in exchange for 50 freeway facing digital billboard structures; PLUM amended the Program to allow takedowns of poster board sized signs (200 square feet) instead of takedowns of actual billboards; PLUM amended the Program to increase hours of operation for freeway-facing signs to operate nearly 24-hours per day from 5:00 a.m. to 3:00 a.m.; PLUM opened the door to extending the digital billboard Program to a 30-year contract instead of the recommended 20-year term; Eight of 12 non-freeway facing digital billboards are planned for installation on the City's High Injury Network street Digital billboards are planned for parcels identified for housing, within 500 feet of open space and residential uses, and impacting historic resources; There has been no cost/benefit analysis and when asked Metro hasn't responded sufficiently; The City has not included any conditions giving City Council the authority to impose additional corrective measures if the digital billboard impacts can't be mitigated as described in the Program, e.g., are proven to increase accidents, light glare, block visibility, etc. Further, there are no provisions to update to new technologies as they become available over the life of this decades-long Program; The LA Times criticized the City in a Dec. 6 Editorial, letters to the Editor in response on Dec. 10, and in an earlier February, 2023 opinion piece.

Communication from Public

Name: Peter Genovese

Date Submitted: 12/12/2023 02:32 PM

Council File No: 22-0392

Comments for Public Posting: Regarding the Digital Billboard Program: I am writing in opposition to this program. As I understand it, this/these companies are backers of Council Member Krekorian. It's rushed. It lacks oversight. What's the hurry. With all the recent criminal indictments and scandals, lately, regarding council persons, I would think that a project of this magnitude's would be, if anything, analyzed overly thorough as regards its impact on the city of Los Angeles' citizens, and without any question as to propriety of its sponsors. Maybe, Council Member Krekorian should recuse himself, as should any council member who has received backing (\$ or free ad support) from the dig companies.

Safety: I have driven in other cities where these Dig Billboards exist, and I find traffic to be congested at the sites where they loom. They are a distraction - ads over traffic info. Motorists wait for the traffic info while the ads run. More road rage. That's what LA needs!! When I go to a concert or a sporting event that have those huge screens, that project the main event that is too small to see from the cheap seats, I remember that I used to use binoculars to achieve that clarity. Now, I lock on to the MEGA SCREENS for the entire event. I think that habit will become a hazard for drivers. If the images were something as simple as a sparsely worded piece of road info, maybe, but as I understand the nature of the images to be shown, they are advertisements. Ads tell a story. They need attention to detail. I don't want to drive under those conditions, and I don't want to share the road with drivers who are distracted by some "I need your attention for a few seconds while you're rear ending that car in front of you."

Entertainment Industry: One of the great things about the tv series Bosch is that it loves, photographically, the city of Los Angeles. Not only is LA__LA, but it doubles for so many more locations; cities towns, neighborhoods, etc, etc. The city was, in a way, designed that way. Put up these MEGA SCREENS, and the choices will narrow for those possible locations. Yes, you may be able to technically delight the MEGA SCREEN out of the scene that is shot in that location, but the added cost will be a decision in the final budget. That may not affect the big companies, but so many other smaller-budget films and commercials will be hard pressed to not pick up, and go to a Chicago or an Atlanta, because of the extra cost. Respectfully. Peter M Genovese 10120 Scoville

Ave Sunland, CA 91040 818 823 6532 genford@verizon.net

Communication from Public

Name: Jeff

Date Submitted: 12/12/2023 02:35 PM

Council File No: 22-0392

Comments for Public Posting: Councilmembers, PLEASE do the right thing and OPPOSE Metro's digital billboard Program at Friday's hearing. The truth is, I think each of you already knows what you should be doing. Why did you run for public office? Was it to serve your community? Make LA a better place to live? Or to open an extremely modest income stream for Metro by helping developers and advertisers? Please think about the quality of the city you lead. And think about the people who live here and whom you represent.....do any of them even WANT these billboards? The LA Times put it well when it said: "Council members need to be clear-eyed about what their vote to allow dozens more light-polluting digital billboards will mean for the quality of life in L.A. They're choosing to sacrifice street safety and the visual landscape for a modest funding stream, and potentially opening the door to more of these bright and distracting billboards. It's not a good trade-off." I want that entire quote to sink it. It's simply not worth the trade off. Vote with your conscience. We'll be watching.

Communication from Public

Name: Jan Reichmann

Date Submitted: 12/12/2023 03:00 PM

Council File No: 22-0392

Comments for Public Posting: The public has spoken loud and clear that they oppose the digital billboard Metro TCN program that endangers drivers and causes outrageous blight to Los Angeles. I congratulate the three councilmembers who opposed the program. In particular, I am deeply disappointed in the leadership of our City who would chase the dollars over 10 years but are willing to risk the lives of others. Please stand up and vote down this outrageous program.

Communication from Public

Name: Jan Reichmann

Date Submitted: 12/12/2023 03:01 PM

Council File No: 22-0392

Comments for Public Posting: The public has spoken loud and clear that they oppose the digital billboard Metro TCN program that endangers drivers and causes outrageous blight to Los Angeles. I congratulate the three councilmembers who opposed the program. In particular, I am deeply disappointed in the leadership of our City who would chase the dollars over 10 years but are willing to risk the lives of others. Please stand up and vote down this outrageous program.

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 12/12/2023 03:15 PM

Council File No: 22-0392

Comments for Public Posting: I am requesting city council and Paul Krekorian to absolutely OPPOSE Metro's digital billboard Program. The city already has too many of these signs. They are a huge distraction.

Communication from Public

Name: Sandy Hubbard

Date Submitted: 12/12/2023 04:09 PM

Council File No: 22-0392

Comments for Public Posting: 12/12/2023 LA City Council File 22-0392 RE: Metro TCN program Position: Opposed Councilmember Krekorian, We have fought for years to keep L.A.'s environment beautiful for all of our present and future generations. It is disappointing the City Council seems poised to sacrifice our visual landscape with light-polluting billboards. Our freeways/highways are some of the best in the world--in large part, because we have reduced the distractions along these very busy corridors, keeping them safer than they might otherwise be. I join with the Coalition for a Beautiful Los Angeles, along with 28 Neighborhood and Community Councils, 24 environmental and community organizations and thousands of Angelenos in opposition to Metro's proposal to install digital billboards along many of the City's busiest freeways and commercial corridors for the following reasons: The Program has now been downsized to include the removal of only 50 existing billboards, and some of those signs are just of poster board dimensions, not actual full-size billboards. This is an insufficient trade-off. The hours of operation for freeway-facing signs have been substantially increased to operate nearly 24-hours per day instead of giving the people who live in the surrounding areas a brief 8-hour break from the ambient lighting. Digital billboards are planned for parcels identified for housing, within 500 feet of open space and residential uses, and impacting historic resources. With the entire State of California in an uproar over housing, why would we choose this particular time to install billboards in lieu of housing? The City has not included any conditions giving City Council the authority to impose additional corrective measures if the digital billboard impacts can't be mitigated--if you proceed with what we all think is a foolhardy decision, you should at least take precautionary steps that allows you to bring to bear mitigation measures. The final paragraph of a recent LAT Editorial Board opinion states this succinctly: "Council members need to be clear-eyed about what their vote to allow dozens more light-polluting digital billboards will mean for the quality of life in L.A. They're choosing to sacrifice street safety and the visual landscape for a modest funding stream, and potentially opening the door to more of these bright and distracting billboards. It's not a good trade-off." Respectfully, Sandy Hubbard Valley Village
For identification purposes only as the opinion of these boards

may or may not be the same as my personal opinion:
Neighborhood Council Valley Village boardmember, Valley
Village Residents Association boardmember, United Neighbors
member

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 12/12/2023 04:29 PM

Council File No: 22-0392

Comments for Public Posting: I join the Coalition for a Beautiful Los Angeles along with 28 Neighborhood and Community Councils, 24 environmental and community organizations and thousands of Angelenos in opposition to Metro's proposal to install digital billboards along many of the City's busiest freeways and commercial corridors!

Communication from Public

Name: Samantha Berman

Date Submitted: 12/12/2023 09:26 PM

Council File No: 22-0392

Comments for Public Posting: Good evening Council member Krekorian, Please vote No on this digital billboard proposal. They are invasive, unsightly, and obnoxious and do nothing to increase the safety or beauty of our city. I was born and raised here in the San Fernando Valley and am now raising two small children here. These signs do nothing to increase my enjoyment of my hometown and changes like this make me consider leaving it. These have no place here. I join the Coalition for a Beautiful Los Angeles along with 28 Neighborhood and Community Councils, 24 environmental and community organizations and thousands of my neighbor Angelenos in opposition to Metro's proposal to install these digital billboards along many of the City's busiest freeways and commercial corridors. Please do the right thing. Thank you. Sam Berman, Valley Village resident